

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

The Applicant has carefully considered the Office Action dated September 4, 2004, and the references it cites. Currently, claims 1-32 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejects:

- claims 1- 3, 5, 6, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,040 to Yi (*Yi*) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203608 to Osann, Jr. (*Osann*);
- claims 7, 8, 10, 20, 21, 23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yi* and *Osann* and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0036700 to Kashio (*Kashio*); and
- claims 4, 17, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yi*, *Osann*, and *Kashio* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,039 to Thomason (*Thomason*).

In response, the Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for transmitting a signal of a moving image in a mobile communication terminal comprising, *inter alia*, a first receiver for receiving a communication signal, a second receiver for receiving a moving image signal, an input section for generating signals for capturing and transmitting a moving image signal, a control section for receiving a command signal for capture and transmission of the moving image signal, and a transmission section for transmitting the captured image stored in the memory.

The Applicant submits that there is no reasonable combination of the cited art that teaches or suggests a second receiver for receiving a moving picture signal. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that a video conferencing function in *Yi* is analogous to the moving picture signal. However, *Yi* describes that the video conferencing function is associated with a communication signal. Thus, *Yi* discloses that the moving picture signal is provided by its communication functions. Accordingly, *Yi* does not teach or suggest a second receiver for receiving the moving picture signal.

The Applicant further submits that the cited art does not cure at least the above-noted deficiencies of *Yi*. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and all claims depending

therefrom would not have been obvious from *Yi* applied alone or in any reasonable combination with *Osann*, *Kashio*, and/or *Thomason*. Further, claim 12 and all claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references for at least substantially the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Turning to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections incorporating *Kashio*. The Applicant submits herewith a certified translation of the originally filed Korean Patent Application. Accordingly, the Applicants have removed *Kashio* as a prior art reference and respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections incorporating *Kashio*. Specifically, the Applicants submit that the rejections of independent claims 25, 26, 27, and 28 should be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

The Applicant submits that the above amendments and arguments are fully responsive to the Office Action dated September 4, 2004. Further, the Applicant submits that, for at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Simon Booth
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 58,582

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
(202) 659-9076

Dated: December 4, 2008